

RESPONSE

Responsive to the Office Action mailed August 24, 2010:

I. NON-PRIOR ART MATTERS

- A. The Office Action rejected claims 12-14, 18 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out an distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 12 and 13 have been cancelled. An appropriate amendment to claims 14 and 18 is enclosed herein.

The invention relates to a system which eases the technical process of establishing a collaboration session between pluralities of clients.

To achieve this result, the invention allows a client to send a message to a messaging system which is associated to the collaboration session manager. The messaging system is able to receive the message transmitted by one of the client and the collaboration session manager can notify the plurality of clients of the collaboration session of the activation of the collaboration session.

The message is transmitted to a specific address of the messaging system, for example whiteboard@domain.com or videoconference@domain.com. In function of the specific address used, the collaboration session is created with the correct parameters.

Indeed, the plurality of clients of the collaboration session doesn't need accomplishing complicated technical manipulations to access to the collaboration session. It is sufficient to send a message to whiteboard@domain.com for creating a collaboration session for example.

Considering the amendment of claims 14 and 18, these claims are no more indefinite. Indeed, claim 14 has been amended in order to claim identified entities (which are the messaging system and the collaboration session manager) which comprise means for realizing the definite functions. For example, the messaging server always has means for receiving messages. The means recited in the claims are already inherently disclosed in the written specification of the

description. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize what structure and material perform the claimed functions.

- B. The Office Action rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as it is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

An amended claim 16 is proposed. A similar amendment has also been made in claim 15. The new wording of the claims is explicitly directed to a statutory subject matter. Thus claim 16 should no longer be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101.

II. PRIOR ART MATTERS

- A. The Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 6-18 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Qi. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

“Qi” relates to a distributed management method of a collaboration session which involves local and distant servers.

Unlike “Qi”, amended claim 1 introduces a feature which relates to the type of the collaboration session and more particularly, this type of collaboration session is associated with a specific address.

On paragraph [0023] “Qi” discloses the general procedure which is initiated to create a collaboration session. In this procedure, it is told that the user sends a request to the CSM. The request includes a list of invitees to the collaboration session.

Furthermore, on paragraph [0029] “Qi” discloses the identification method which is used to ensure that a user is allowed access to the collaboration session.

“Qi” never stated that the “request” which is transmitted to the CSM can be of various types, each type corresponding to a specific address associated with the plurality of address of the messaging system.

Thus, the invention allows specifying a particular collaboration session type by employing a specific address associated with the messaging system. For example, if the user wishes to initiate a “white board” collaboration session, he sends the message to the address “whiteboard@domain.com”, whereas if the user wishes to initiate a Visio conference, he sends the message to the address “videoconference@domain.com”

Thus, amended Claim 1 is novel (35 USC 102).

A single prior art reference anticipates a claimed invention only if it discloses each and every claim element.¹ “For a prior art reference to anticipate...every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference...These elements must be arranged as in the claim under review.”² “This standard is very strict. It requires an exact correspondence between the contents of the event and the claim limitations, such that each and every element recited in the claim is present in the anticipatory event.”³

Qi does not disclose:

- that the message is sent to a messaging system;
 - o the CSM of “Qi” (the CSM is the system which is the closest of the system of the invention) is not a messaging system; Thus “the request” of “Qi” is not a “message” like the first received message in the first step of claim 1 (that is a message sent to a specific address like whiteboard@domain.com or videoconference@domain.com or any other specific address).
- that the message is sent to a specific address,
 - o As the CSM of “Qi” is not a messaging system, the message cannot be sent to a specific address (i.e. whiteboard@domain.com or videoconference@domain.com or any other specific address);

¹*Net Moneyin, Inc. v. Versign, Inc.* (Fed. Cir. Appeal No. 2007-1565, decided October 20, 2008) (holding that ‘unless a reference discloses within the four corners of the document not only all of the limitations claimed but also all of the limitations arranged or combined in the same way as recited in the claim, it cannot be said to prove prior invention of the thing claimed and, thus, cannot anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102.’)

²*Net Moneyin, Inc. v. Versign, Inc.* (Fed. Cir. Appeal No. 2007-1565, decided October 20, 2008) (holding that ‘unless a reference discloses within the four corners of the document not only all of the limitations claimed but also all of the limitations arranged or combined in the same way as recited in the claim, it cannot be said to prove prior invention of the thing claimed and, thus, cannot anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102.’)

³*Net Moneyin, Inc. v. Versign, Inc.* (Fed. Cir. Appeal No. 2007-1565, decided October 20, 2008) (holding that ‘unless a reference discloses within the four corners of the document not only all of the limitations claimed but also all of the limitations arranged or combined in the same way as recited in the claim, it cannot be said to prove prior invention of the thing claimed and, thus, cannot anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102.’)

- Furthermore, there is no mention of a specific address in “Qi”. The “addresses” which are disclosed in “Qi” are the addresses of the
- that the specific address is related to a type of a collaboration session.
- This feature is not disclosed in “Qi” and the type of the type of a collaboration session is not disclosed.

In order to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102, “the prior art reference...must not only disclose all elements of the claim within the four corners of the document, but must also disclose those elements ‘arranged as in the claim’.”⁴


Therefore claims 1-4, 6-18 are patentable over Qi.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of all claims and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-3732.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7 Dec 10

By 
 Gerald E. Helget (Reg. No. 30,948)
 Nelson R. Capes (Reg. No. 37,106)
 BRIGGS AND MORGAN, P.A.
 2200 IDS Center, 80 South Eighth Street
 Minneapolis, MN 55402
 Telephone: 612-977-8480
 Facsimile: 612-977-8650

⁴*Net Moneyin, Inc. v. Versign, Inc.* (Fed. Cir. Appeal No. 2007-1565, decided October 20, 2008) (holding that ‘unless a reference discloses within the four corners of the document not only all of the limitations claimed but also all of the limitations arranged or combined in the same way as recited in the claim, it cannot be said to prove prior invention of the thing claimed and, thus, cannot anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102.’)”